DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 479 JC 840 004

AUTHOR Kocher, Earl D.; Houston, Charles
TITLE How Do You Rate?
PUB DATE 2 Aug 83
NOTE 8p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Southeastern Association for Community College Research, "Community Colleges in the Information Society" (12th, Myrtle Beach, SC, August 1-3, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Class Size; College Faculty; Community Colleges; Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Evaluation; Females; Males; Questionnaires; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Mountain Empire Community College VA

ABSTRACT

An attempt was made at Mountain Empire Community College to develop and implement an impartial and equitable method of faculty evaluation. As part of this process, an instrument was developed to provide both a quantitative and qualitative student rating of faculty. The instrument contains 10 questions covering the syllabus/course outline, objectives, course content, grading system, assignments, identification of student responsibilities, and instructor's fairness and ability to stimulate students and help them comprehend. Each of the 10 statements is weighted on the basis of students' strength of agreement or disagreement. In fall 1982, each faculty member distributed the form to his/her classes, and a mean score for each instructor was computed for use in the overall evaluation plan. An analysis was later conducted to assess whether the size of the class or the sex of the instructor significantly affected faculty ratings. Results of the analysis indicated that there was no significant difference between mean faculty ratings for small, medium, or large classes and that mean ratings for male and female instructors were not significantly different. The rating instrument and instructions for administering it are appended. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED238479

HOW DO YOU RATE?

Earl D. Kocher
Director of Institutional Research and Computer Services
Mountain Empire Community College
Big Stone Gap, Virginia

Charles Houston
Director of Institutional Research
Virginia Western Community College
Roanoke, Virginia

Presented at SACCR 1983 Annual Conference
Myrtle Beach, South Carolina
August 2, 1983

JC 840 004

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

✓ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Earl Kocher

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HOW DO YOU RATE?

For the past several years, Mountain Empire Community College has, like many other colleges, attempted to develop and implement an impartial and equatable method for evaluating teaching at the college.

Like most other colleges they, too, found there is no utopia concerning evaluation. Unlike many other colleges, though, MECC placed a high institutional priority on evaluation and sought a comprehensive package that would be acceptable to both the faculty and the administration. This first step in their effort did not go unrewarded as they were selected to participate in the National Faculty Evaluation project sponsored by the University of Florida. They were one of eight schools chosen for this three year study. Much of the methodology for the college's evaluation plan was developed as a result of that project.

The academic year 1983-84 will be the pilot year for the implementation of the yet to be approved evaluation plan.

A small but integral part of that plan was the module for student ratings. That module is the topic of this paper. Without going into great detail, after many meetings and drafts, this module evolved in conceptual form and was reduced to a rating instrument to be administered by the faculty to at least two classes in the Fall and Spring quarters. This instrument resulted from a modified delfi technique where consensus was obtained for the questions by both the faculty and administration.

The primary purpose of this instrument was to rate the faculty in such a way that both quantitative and qualitative analysis would result.

The qualitative issue was overshadowed by attempts to equalize the quantitative outcomes. The instrument, after being sent to committees again, emerged as a four point rating sheet with narrative statements attached to each of the four values.

Because the administrator is burdened with the responsibility of faculty evaluation and most faculty members desire a nonthreatening evaluation method, where improvement of instruction is the bottom line. Any instrument leaves something to be desired by one group or another.

The one page "Student Opinion of Instruction" (Appendix A) consists of ten uniform questions used collegewide. The original thoughts of the committee were that only a few of the questions would be used for evaluation and the balance would be used for the purpose of the faculty member. The current thought is that the ten questions will remain as is and that at the option of the faculty member at a time other than Fall or Spring, another instrument could be administered.

Although the SAS program written to evaluate the ratings on the instrument allows for up to twenty questions, only ten are used.

The procedure for administering the instrument is outlined in Appendix B.

This past Fall quarter, each faculty member had the form administered to his or her classes, the data was then keypunched and the program applied.

The results of the analysis were then returned to the member with a summary copy going to the Division Chairmen to be used for the puporse of evaluation. The program computes an individual mean for each faculty member and displays in bar graph form the results of that rating. The Division Chairmen's copy is a summary of the total means. That score is then used in the overall evaluation plan.

At this point, one could say that this module was completed and therefore, the process could be forgotten until the next evaluation period. It would have been easy to do just that, but too many questions were left unanswered. The two most obvious questions seemed to be does the sex of the faculty member or class size have any affect on the rating results.

These questions prompted further study. Charles Houston was contacted and graciously consented to co-author this paper. His analysis of the data are interesting and found to be consistent with Graham, 1972, and Guthrie, 1954, in their related studies.

The following research questions were hypothesized:

1. Does the size of a class (large 21-up, medium 11-20, small 0-10) affect the mean rating of faculty ratings?
2. Do mean faculty ratings differ for male and female instructors?

Table I provides an analysis of various table and mean evaluation averages for small, medium and large classes.

TABLE I

ANOVA and Means by Class Size

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between class size	2	39.6	19.3	.7	.485
Within class sizes	843	23119.1	27.4		
TOTAL	845	23158.7			

	Small	Medium	Large
Means	34.8	35.1	34.6

Results of the analysis indicated that there was no significant difference between mean faculty ratings for small, medium or large classes.

Table II provides an analysis of various table and mean evaluation averages for male and female instructors.

TABLE II

ANOVA and Means by Sex of Instructor

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between male/ female	1	58.6	58.6	2.14	0.144
Within male/ female	844	23100.1	27.4		
TOTAL	845	23158.7			

	Male	Female
Means	34.9	36.2

Results of the analysis indicates that the mean rating of male and female instructors were not significantly different.

It would appear that the two most obvious factors did not influence the rating results and therefore we could conclude with some degree of assurance that our original purpose to design an impartial and equatable instrument was achieved. The questions of validity, reliability, subject matter and quantity vs. quality are yet to be answered.

For more information concerning this area, one might read Jossey-Bass' book titled Evaluating Faculty Performance and Vitality.

References:

Graham, M. J. "The Relationship Between ECQ Ratings and Instructor Rank, Class Size and Course Level", Report No. 337, University of Illinois, 1972.

Guthery, E. R. "The Evaluation of Teaching: A Progress Report", University of Washington, 1954.

APPENDIX A

STUDENT OPINION OF INSTRUCTION

This questionnaire gives you an opportunity to express anonymously your views of this course and the way it has been taught. Indicate the response closest to your view by marking the appropriate square.

MECC	REPORT	-	NUMBER

DIRECTIONS

Mark one response for each statement.

SA (4) Strongly Agree. You strongly agree with the statement as it applies to this course or instructor.

A (3) Agree. You agree more than you disagree with the statement as it applies to this course or instructor.

D (2) Disagree. You disagree more than you agree with the statement as it applies to this course or instructor.

SD (1) Strongly Disagree. You strongly disagree with the statement as it applies to this course or instructor.

NA (0) Not Applicable or don't know. The statement does not apply to this course or instructor, or you simply are not able to give a knowledgeable response.

		SA	A	D	SD	NA
1.	A course outline and/or syllabus was provided to me early in the course.	4	3	2	1	0
2.	This course has clearly stated objectives.	4	3	2	1	0
3.	Course content, including discussions, assignments, tests, and activities are consistent with the course objectives.	4	3	2	1	0
4.	The grading system was clearly explained.	4	3	2	1	0
5.	The instructor identifies the student's responsibilities in the course.	4	3	2	1	0
6.	Assignments are related to the goals of this course.	4	3	2	1	0
7.	The instructor readily maintains rapport with the class, and each student is encouraged to contribute.	4	3	2	1	0
8.	The instructor recognizes when some students fail to comprehend, and is actively helpful when students have problems.	4	3	2	1	0
9.	Grades are an accurate assessment of my knowledge in this course, and they are assigned fairly and impartially.	4	3	2	1	0
10.	The instructor stimulates interest in this course and has effectively challenged me to think.	4	3	2	1	0

MOUNTAIN EMPIRE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
STUDENT OPINION OF INSTRUCTION
INSTRUCTIONS FOR PROCTOR

1. Explain to the class the purposes of the evaluation:

   a. To provide information to the faculty member regarding any strengths and/or weaknesses he/she may have concerning the teaching of this course.

   b. To provide the college administration with information.

   Your input concerning this faculty member's performance therefore is very important. Please take this process very seriously. To insure anonymity, the forms will be computer processed and the results will not be made available to the faculty member until final student grades have been turned in.

2. Distribute Student Opinion of Instruction forms to all students.

3. Put the following information on the chalkboard and ask students to fill in the blanks at the top of each sheet with the faculty social security number.

   MECC REPORT NUMBER

4. Instruct students to darken the number which corresponds to their response for each question -

   4 - Strongly agree
   3 - Agree
   2 - Disagree
   1 - Strongly disagree
   0 - Not applicable or don't know

5. When everyone is finished, collect all forms and seal in the envelope provided.

6. Deliver envelope to the division office (Room No. A131) or to the library.

ERIC® CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

FEB 10 1984

8118 Math-Sciences Building
Los Angeles, California 90024